

ADAM Addenda (rev'd 02/01)

One of the strengths of the ADAM program is the research platform it provides to sites interested in examining a variety of issues associated with the arrestee population. Addenda to the ADAM interview provide a useful mechanism for exploring these issues. Before addenda research can occur at a site, however, the following details must be completed:

- A source of funding outside of the ADAM Program will need to be secured by the site to pay for all expenses related to the implementation/administration of the addenda, data entry/data preparation for the addenda, analysis of the addenda data, and dissemination of the addenda findings. NIJ encourages sites to seek out and obtain funding for addenda work from a variety of federal, state, local and foundation sources.
- All addenda must be reviewed by an IRB for compliance with federal guidelines on the protection of human subjects.
- Sites need to demonstrate that the use of an addendum will not detract from collecting data in the core ADAM instrument. The addition of a very long addendum could deter arrestees from responding to the core instrument or limited shift time might decrease the total number of core interviews possible. It is important to remember that collection of the core instrument data and urine specimen take priority over any addenda collection; as part of a site's subcontract authorizing ADAM data collection, it is obligated contractually to collect a minimum number of complete interviews depending on its individual sampling plans.
- All addenda administered during regular ADAM data collection must be NIJ approved. If an addendum is not part of the NIJ Addenda Library located at the ADAM Data Center, it must be forwarded to NIJ for review (allow at least four weeks for review).
- The request for administration of a NIJ-approved addendum must be submitted to the ADAM Data Center through the site's liaison at least four weeks before scheduled data collection.
- All requests for administration of addenda must be accompanied by a Working Plan submitted by the site director and his/her local coordinating council (LCC). This Working Plan should detail the site's plan to analyze the data and disseminate findings.

A number of addenda have been used by the sites in the past, including: A firearm addendum, methamphetamine addendum, crack cocaine addendum, powder cocaine addendum, marijuana addendum, heroin addendum, firearms, domestic violence and gang addendum. In addition, sites can develop their own addenda on topics of concern in their communities. Addenda

on domestic violence, HIV, firearms, dual diagnosis, and pathological gambling are currently being developed/revised.

Sites are encouraged to provide feedback on the usefulness of available addenda. These addenda have not been subject to rigorous methodological testing. They have been pretested in a few sites around the country, and changes have been made based on those pretests. But sites should consider these addenda as open for change should the need arise. Please be in contact with your site liaisons concerning your experience and observations about the addenda. NIJ will make a concerted effort in FY2001 to evaluate all the previously approved addenda in terms of their content, reliability, and capabilities to walk between the addenda and major national data collection instruments (e.g., Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, Bureau of Justice Statistics).

The addenda are designed to provide additional data to sites on topics of particular interest to their jurisdictions. Site personnel will have a good idea which areas warrant focus. In addition, a site's Local Coordinating Council (LCC) will assist sites in determining topics for study. For example, if a site is experiencing problems with crime involving firearms, the firearm addendum might be an appropriate choice. Or, if the community experiences problems with a particular drug, that drug addendum would provide useful information.

When determining which, if any, of these addenda you would like to use, you first should assess whether the use of an addendum would detract from collecting data in the core ADAM instrument. The firearm addendum, for example, takes approximately five minutes to administer. Given this relatively short time frame, the likelihood that data collection from the core instrument will be jeopardized is minimal. The gang addendum, on the other hand, requires 15-20 minutes to complete. The addition of an addendum this long could deter arrestees from responding to the core instrument or limited shift time might decrease the total number of core interviews possible. It is important to remember that collection of the core instrument data and urine specimen take priority over any addenda collection; as part of a site's subcontract authorizing ADAM data collection, it is obligated contractually to collect a minimum number of complete interviews depending on its individual sampling plans.

Module D consists of seven sections; one for each available addendum. Each section contains question-by-question guidance on how to administer the addendum, followed by a copy of the specific addendum. The description below attempts to inform sites about the contents of each addendum, providing a rough measure on the suitability of the addendum for their sites. As new addendum become available, they will be added to this module.

Section 1 contains the firearm addendum. This addendum focuses on the accessibility and availability of firearms. It represents a condensed version of the prior gun addendum. After using the gun addendum for several years, it was decided that several questions added length but little substantive knowledge about firearm use. The current firearm addendum asks about firearm ownership, reasons for ownership, source of firearms, type of firearm, possession during offense or at any time, and use of firearm in commission of offense.

Sections 2 through 6 focus on specific drugs of abuse. While each addendum focuses on a particular drug, the basic structure of the addenda is virtually identical, asking questions about use, purchase, and sale of these illegal substances. The addenda for marijuana and methamphetamine are the exception. These addenda ask questions about growing and manufacturing each substance, respectively. The methamphetamine addendum was modeled after an instrument developed by Susan Pennell in San Diego, CA, and Denise Herz in Omaha, NE, and represents the base for the Meth Matters report produced by Pennell, et al. The two cocaine and heroin addenda were developed by NIJ, with the assistance of Bruce Johnson, NY, and represents the base for the Crack, Powder Cocaine, and Heroin: Drug Purchase and Use Patterns in Six U.S. Cities by Riley, et al.

Section 2 focuses on marijuana, Section 3 on powder cocaine, Section 4 on crack cocaine, Section 5 on heroin, and Section 6 on methamphetamine. Each drug addendum asks questions about use, side effects, treatment, drug quality, purchase, source, quantity, availability, cost, and sales. The marijuana addendum asks similar questions about growing the substance, e.g., quantity, cost. The methamphetamine addendum asks the same questions about manufacturing the substance.

Section 7 contains the gang addendum. This addendum was developed in collaboration with Jody Miller of the University of Missouri at St. Louis, and is designed to explore gang-related behavior. The addendum is divided into four sections, with each section asking a similar series of questions. The four sections include current gang or other group not calling itself a gang membership, former gang or other group membership, friends with current membership, and friends with former membership. The addendum opens with general questions about whether the arrestee perceives gangs to be a problem in their neighborhoods. In general, the four sections ask questions about: gang or group membership, the gang or group name, age at membership, demographics of gang or group including size, gender, racial composition, existence of sets or cliques within gangs or groups, identification with gang or group, illegal activities, support for gang or group, firearms, and other city affiliations.

If sites are interested in administering an addendum during a particular quarter, they must inform their site liaisons at least four weeks in advance of data collection to ensure that NIJ approval is obtained, and proper supplies and training materials are forwarded in advance of quarterly enhancement training.

NIJ Policy Regarding Addenda Data:

All data collected during the regular ADAM data collection period [at all sites] are the property of NIJ and thus subject to all DOJ and NIJ policies and procedures. This includes submitting a working plan for the project, a full IRB review of the item, and a privacy certificate of project staff (if other than regular ADAM staff).

Sites interested in developing their own addenda should notify NIJ and their site liaisons. In developing new addenda, sites should pay close attention to other data collection efforts, ensuring that addenda questions crosswalk to these other collection instruments. All addenda development must include analytic plans for how data will be used.

Violation of Addenda Data Collection Policies:

The use of addenda serves as an important tool for local ADAM sites. However, their use may jeopardize the collection of the core ADAM data. Therefore, sites must be vigilant about reporting the use of addenda and write a brief report each quarter detailing how or whether the addenda had any effect on regular data collection, e.g., increased time with each respondent, increased breakoffs, fewer urine specimen provided. As we work to standardize sites, addenda have the potential to disrupt these procedures, making it difficult to compare data across sites or across quarters within sites.

Failing to inform the ADAM Data Center of addenda collection can result in suspension of ADAM data collection the following quarter until a correction plan can be put in place. Also, failing to gain NIJ approval prior to using an addendum can result in data collection suspension. While we do not want to discourage the use of addenda, it is important to use them in the context of the program's first objective – collection of data for the core ADAM interview instrument.

